

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,495	11/27/2001	Doug Rollins	M4065.0486/P486	8165
<sup>24998</sup> DICKSTEIN S	7590 03/01/2007 HAPIRO LLP		EXAMINER	
1825 EYE STR	REET NW		GELAGAY, SHEWAYE	
Washington, D	C 20006-3403		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	
				<del></del>
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/993,495	ROLLINS, DOUG	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Shewaye Gelagay	2137	

	Shewaye Gelagay	2137	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in or	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is</li> </ul>			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70		FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the self to the in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, leading the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, leading the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, leading the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection.</li> </ol>	,		ecause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. = 20.0,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			(270) 00()
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	·	-	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12 and 14-16</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
15. 🗀 Ottlet			
·			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argued neither Serceki alone or in combination with Lewis teaches "physically separating from said wireless station a network communication device containing said encryption key which is accessed for used by said wireless station during communication". The examiner respectfully disagrees. Serceki discloses a network device for physically exchanging encryption keys in a wireless network and network administrators create the device. (page 1, paragraph 8, page 3, paragraph 32) Furthermore, Serceki teaches the network device can begin downloading updated keys at a company that may have several stations located through out the office space. (page 4, paragraphs 41-45) Lewis discloses a wireless terminal that carries out an encrypted communication by providing and an access point which periodically communicates a new encryption key to maintain a secure wireless link even when updating the wireless terminal (figure 6, item 210; col. 12, lines 31-63)

The applicant argued that Campbell and Trieger fail to teach "physically separating from said wireless station a network communication device containing said encryption key which is accessed for used by said wireless station during communication". The examiner would like to point both references have not been used to teach that particular limitation.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100